REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 7, and 14 have been amended. Support for the changes can found in Figures 2, 3A-3C, 4, and 5A-5B.

Objection to the Oath/Declaration

The Examiner objected to the Oath "because it does contain the original signature or date of the signature of the applicant."

Applicant thanks the Examiner for agreeing to remove the objection in a conversation on Sep. 14, 2005.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,384,811 B1 by Kung, et al. ("Kung").

Kung discloses using two pairs of links to connect a display of a portable computer to the main frame. The display module is movable among (1) a closed position where the display module is disposed on top of the main frame module with the display panel facing downwardly and covering the keyboard, (2) a standard keyboard typing position where the display panel forms an angle with the keyboard, and (3) an image viewing position where the display module is disposed on top of the main frame module and covers the keyboard with the display panel facing upwardly.

Claims 1-5

Applicant submits that independent claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Kung. Claim 1 recites:

An apparatus comprising:

a base:

a lid;

a first link hinged to the base about a first axis at a first position, and hinged to the lid about a second axis; and

a second link hinged to the base about a third axis at a second position, and hinged to the lid about a fourth axis, wherein a distance between the first position and the second position is shorter than one half of the length of the base.

(Claim 1 as amended, emphasis added).

As seen in Kung's Figures 2-9, the distance between a position (Kung reference number 32) where the first link hinges to the base and the distance between a position (Kung reference number 30) where the second link hinges to the base is greater than one half of the length of the base. In fact, Kung's three positions would not be possible if this were not the case. The only way Kung's system could maintain all three positions while maintaining a shorter distance the mentioned hinging positions is if there were more locking holes in the display panel.

Therefore, Kung does not teach or suggest a distance between the first position and the second position is shorter than one half of the length of the base, as claimed. As such, Kung does not anticipate independent claim 1, and associated dependent claims 2-5.

Claims 7-11

Applicant submits that independent claim 7, as amended, is not anticipated by Kung. Claim 7 recites:

An apparatus comprising:

a base:

a lid:

a first link pivotally coupled to the base and pivotally coupled to the lid; and

a second link pivotally coupled to the base and pivotally coupled to the lid, the first and second link positioned to position an edge of the display a distance from a first edge of the base towards a second opposite edge of the base, when the lid is in an unfolded position, wherein a distance between the first edge and a position of hinging of the second link to the base is shorter than the distance between the position of hinging of the second link to the base and the second edge of the base.

(Claim 7 as amended, emphasis added).

As seen in Kung's Figures 2-9, the distance between the first edge (close to Kung's reference number 32) and a position of hinging of the second link to the base (Kung's reference number 30) is greater than the distance between the position of hinging of the second link to the base (Kung's reference number 30) and the second edge of the base (close to Kung's reference number 34).

Therefore, Kung does not teach or suggest "a distance between the first edge and a position of hinging of the second link to the base is shorter than the distance between the position of hinging of the second link to the base and the second edge of the base," as claimed. As such, Kung does not anticipate independent claim 7, and associated dependent claims 8-11.

Claims 14-16

Applicant submits that independent claim 14, as amended, is not anticipated by Kung. Claim 14 recites:

An apparatus comprising:

a base;

a lid:

a first link pivotally coupled to a first edge of the base at a first position and pivotally coupled to lid, a first distance from an edge of the lid; and

a second link pivotally coupled to the base at a second position, a second distance from the first link, and pivotally coupled to an edge of the lid, wherein a distance between the first position and second position is shorter than one half of the length of the base.

(Claim 14 as amended, emphasis added).

As seen in Kung's Figures 2-9, the distance between the first position where the first link hinges to the base (Kung's reference number 32) and a second position of hinging of the second link to the base (Kung's reference number 30) is greater than the one half of the length of the base.

Therefore, Kung does not teach or suggest "a distance between the first position and second position is shorter than one half of the length of the base," as claimed. As such, Kung does not anticipate independent claim 14, and associated dependent claims 15-16.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6, 12, 13 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kung in view of US Patent No. 6,654,234 B2 by Landry, et al. ("Landry").

Landry discloses a connector arm rotated about a hinge structure outwardly from the base of a portable computer to an angular orientation. (Landry, Fig. 10; col. 7, lines 34-10). Landry does not disclose a pair of links, as claimed in independent claims 1, 7, and 14.

Claim 6

As discussed above, Kung does not teach or suggest a distance between the first position and the second position is shorter than one half of the length of the base, as claimed in claim 1. Landry does not supply this missing element because Landry does not teach a pair of links.

As such, claim 6, which depends from and includes each and every limitation of claim 1, is not obvious over Kung and Landry.

Claims 12 and 13

As discussed above, Kung does not teach or suggest "a distance between the first edge and a position of hinging of the second link to the base is shorter than the distance between the position of hinging of the second link to the base and the second edge of the base," as claimed in claim 7. Landry does not supply this missing element because Landry does not teach a pair of links.

As such, claims 12 and 13, which depend from and include each and every limitation of claim 7, are not obvious over Kung and Landry.

Claim 17

As discussed above, Kung does not teach or suggest "a distance between the first position and second position is shorter than one half of the length of the base," as claimed in claim 14. Landry does not supply this missing element because Landry does not teach a pair of links.

As such, claim 17, which depends from and includes each and every limitation of claim 14, is not obvious over Kung and Landry.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-17 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Tom Ferrill at (408) 720-8300.

Deposit Account Authorization

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Dated: 10-26, 2005

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Thomas S. Ferrill Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 42,532

12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026 (408) 720-8300